

EXHIBIT 20

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

PHILLIPS, L.G., LCD CO., LTD,)
)
 Plaintiffs,) C.A. No. 04-343 (JJF)
)
 v.)
)
 TATUNG CO., TATUNG COMPANY OF)
 AMERICA, INC., and VIEWSONIC)
 CORPORATION,)
)
 Defendants.)

Hearing of above matter taken pursuant to notice before Renee A. Meyers, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public, in the law offices of BLANK ROME, LLP, 1201 North Market Street, Wilmington, Delaware, on Friday, January 19, 2007, beginning at approximately 11:45 a.m., there being present:

BEFORE: VINCENT J. POPPITI, SPECIAL MASTER

APPEARANCES:

THE BAYARD FIRM
RICHARD D. KIRK, ESQ.
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
for Plaintiffs

CORBETT & WILCOX
Registered Professional Reporters
230 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 571-0510
www.corbettreporting.com
Corbett & Wilcox is not affiliated
with Wilcox & Fetzer, Court Reporters

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 MCKENNA, LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP 3 CASS W. CHRISTENSON, ESQ. 4 REL S. AMBROZY, ESQ. 5 JESSE KOKRDA, ESQ. 6 LORA BRZEZYSKI, ESQ. 7 1900 K Street, N.W. 8 Washington, D.C. 20006 9 for Plaintiffs 10 11 RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER 12 FREDERICK L. COTTRELL, III, ESQ. 13 ANNE SHEA GAZA, ESQ. 14 One Rodney Square 15 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 16 for Defendant Tatung Co. 17 GREENBERG TRAUIG LLP 18 FRANK MERIDETH, ESQ. 19 VALERIE HO, ESQ. 20 2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E 21 Santa Monica, California 90404 22 for Defendant Tatung Company of America, Inc. 23 24 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP JACQUELINE MASON, ESQ. 1007 North Orange Street Wilmington, Delaware 19899 for Defendant Viewsonic Corporation BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP SCOTT R. MILLER, ESQ. MANUEL NELSON, ESQ. 355 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071-3106 for Defendant Viewsonic Corporation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 global, if you will. It would encompass what you have 2 already briefed and it would encompass any supplemental 3 briefing on additional claim terms. 4 So, with that, the expectation is that 5 that permits you to direct your focus on other work and 6 on other deadlines as contemplated by the order. 7 So, as I would expect paragraph five to 8 operate, it is really supplemental opening briefing, if 9 you will, on additional claim terms and a global 10 responsive brief on everything that you have briefed 11 heretofore and the new terms that you briefed by April 12 30. 13 Does that answer LPL's suggestion of a 14 discussion topic? 15 MR. AMBROZY: Your Honor, this is Rel 16 Ambrozy. The thing that we are curious about was I think 17 we had previously identified either today -- I think it 18 was the 19th of January as the date for defendants to 19 identify additional claim terms, so if I understand you 20 correctly, they don't need to do that until we exchange 21 the chart on the 15th; is that right? 22 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: No. This, 23 again, as I see the operation of this document, I am just 24 referring to briefing.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I sincerely 2 appreciate the work that local counsel did last night to 3 agenda items that are ripe for some discussion, not 4 necessarily ripe for determination, but for at least ripe 5 for some discussion, and I will use the agenda that 6 Miss Mason and others prepared, so I am looking at the 7 January 19th document which I received this morning. 8 The first item on the agenda is 9 questions regarding the Amended Rule 16 Scheduling Order 10 which Judge Farnan issued on January 17th, and let me 11 suggest, perhaps, some items that certainly should be 12 discussed and entertain any discussion with respect to 13 any other items that you all need to bring to my 14 attention. 15 No. 1 -- and this may address the 16 request of LPL that defendants identify whether they seek 17 briefing on any additional claim terms -- looking at 18 paragraph five of the Amended Rule 16C Scheduling Order, 19 I expect that the way that is intended to operate is that 20 rather than filing a response brief by each of you on 21 January 31, 2007, that filing date would be forestalled 22 and the filing date for responsive briefs in the 23 paragraph five that I just referenced to be filed on May 24 15 of 2007, would be the response briefs that would be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 MR. AMBROZY: Okay. That's all I wanted 2 to know. Thank you, Your Honor. 3 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: None of the 4 other dates in the scheduling order, unless they have 5 been addressed by this supplement, should be considered 6 changed. 7 MR. CHRISTENSON: Your Honor, Cass 8 Christenson for LPL. I think, as a point of 9 clarification, LPL was wondering whether there are, 10 indeed, any additional terms that would require briefing 11 at this point given the fact that LPL has withdrawn some 12 of the additional claims from the process, so -- 13 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I understand 14 your comment, and that really is for you all to discuss. 15 Whether you want to discuss it now or whether you want to 16 discuss it off-line, it matters not to me. If you want 17 to take this time to do that, please feel free to do 18 that, but I -- 19 MR. AMBROZY: Your Honor, that's why I 20 brought up the January 19th date that the Court had set. 21 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Sure. And I 22 understand that the landscape has changed somewhat, so 23 if, by virtue of what you have done, we don't need to 24 operate under the amended order, then certainly tell me</p>

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 that. But what I was expecting is if there is the need 2 for supplemental briefing, that paragraph five addresses 3 that.</p> <p>4 MR. AMBROZY: Your Honor, that's why we 5 were curious about sticking to the January 19th date 6 because if there are no additional terms, then we don't 7 believe there would be a need to modify the original 8 paragraph eight of the scheduling order.</p> <p>9 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, this is Scott 10 Miller for Viewsonic. I think where we are today is we 11 believe there are probably two or three terms that are 12 going to be, from our standpoint, that we have identified 13 that likely will be submitted. The one thing that's 14 missing from the proposed amended schedule that was in 15 the original scheduling order was a process by which 16 terms were identified, which we had as the 19th, and then 17 the question of the parties exchanging proposed 18 constructions to see if they could reach some agreement 19 as to the meaning of those terms or not or at least know 20 where everybody's proposed construction is prior to 21 updating the chart on the 15th.</p> <p>22 I don't know if there is -- if it's 23 possible to set a date for that exchange of proposed 24 constructions?</p>	<p>1 constructions which would be February 5th.</p> <p>2 MR. AMBROZY: We are okay with that.</p> <p>3 And I think within two weeks from the February 5th date, 4 I think we could exchange and determine whether the 5 claims even require briefing. And if they do, then we 6 just stick with your new paragraph five of the claim 7 chart being updated on April 15th. We would brief the 8 new terms on April 30, and then we'd have the one single 9 response brief on May 15.</p> <p>10 MR. MILLER: If there is no new opening 11 brief, then we would just, presumably, have the response 12 brief on May 15th?</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Right.</p> <p>14 MR. AMBROZY: I am just concerned -- I 15 see also that the scheduling order requires a Markman 16 hearing no later than May 30.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Yes.</p> <p>18 MR. AMBROZY: And you believe that 19 getting the response brief by May 15 is enough time to 20 conduct that hearing by the 30th?</p> <p>21 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Yes.</p> <p>22 MR. AMBROZY: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>23 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: So, if those 24 dates make sense to everyone, consider them done. And,</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: No reason not 2 to.</p> <p>3 MR. MILLER: Excuse me?</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I said, "There 5 is no reason not to."</p> <p>6 Do you want to discuss that now?</p> <p>7 MR. MILLER: Sure. As to exchanging the 8 proposed terms, we had targeted today as the date. Given 9 the change and everything else that's gone on, I was sort 10 of hoping that we could move it to Monday, but if we have 11 to do it today we can do it to leave it to the prior 12 schedule, but Monday would just be more convenient so 13 that we could finalize those terms. So we could do it, 14 from my standpoint, by noon on Monday, our time, which 15 would be 3:00 Eastern Time so there wouldn't be a huge 16 loss of opportunity.</p> <p>17 And then I would suggest maybe the 18 parties exchange proposed constructions perhaps two weeks 19 after that so that they can -- it's going to be a small 20 number of terms, so we could do it more quickly if people 21 want, but I am just trying to fit it into, because we are 22 going to have a lot of discovery happening given the 23 discovery cutoff date that's been established, so my 24 thought was sort of two weeks to do exchange of proposed</p>	<p>1 again, I would, although I can go through the transcript 2 when I have it to issue those dates from my desk, if 3 someone would do the courtesy of capturing them and 4 circulating them to make sure we are all on the same page 5 with dates and send it to me either close of business 6 today or midday on Monday, that would be great.</p> <p>7 MS. MASON: Your Honor, this is 8 Jacqueline Mason. That's fine. Local counsel will work 9 together again to get that to you.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Appreciate 11 that.</p> <p>12 MR. AMBROZY: Your Honor, Rel Ambrozy 13 again.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Yes.</p> <p>15 MR. AMBROZY: Paragraph one of your new 16 Amended Rule 16 discusses that, in the italics, including 17 all deposition as well as interrogatories and document 18 discovery directed to the new claims.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Yes.</p> <p>20 MR. AMBROZY: But then in paragraph two, 21 it talks about ten additional interrogatories, ten 22 requests for admissions, and ten document requests. I 23 just want to clarify, since the request for admissions 24 were not captured in paragraph one, that the ten</p>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 additional requests for admission are limited to just the 2 new terms. 3 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Just to the new 4 terms, that's correct. 5 MR. AMBROZY: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 MR. MILLER: New terms or the new 7 claims? 8 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: New claims. 9 MR. MILLER: Thank you. 10 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Sorry, the new 11 claims. 12 Next question on the scheduling order: 13 Are there any other issues that you see need to be 14 discussed? 15 MR. KIRK: Your Honor, this is Dick Kirk 16 for the plaintiff, for LPL. I do have one that I would 17 like to discuss with Your Honor this morning. The 18 original scheduling order said that depositions -- 19 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Mr. Kirk, which 20 scheduling order are you referring to? 21 MR. KIRK: Well, the very original one, 22 8/18, 2005. 23 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I have that. 24 MR. KIRK: Paragraph 4E said that</p>	<p>1 serving, and probably fighting about third-party 2 depositions in that short of time within the next 70 3 days, I guess, is what we have, so we would like to talk 4 about that if we could. 5 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: Well, yeah. 6 Certainly talk about it. I did bring your request to the 7 attention of Judge Farnan, so he was aware of the request 8 that was mutual to deal with issues involving third-party 9 discovery as you described. 10 MR. KIRK: Would Your Honor want us, 11 LPL, or everybody, to maybe file a motion addressing this 12 particular item? 13 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I don't know 14 that I need a motion. What I'd like you to do, knowing 15 that it is now more clearly my responsibility to manage 16 this going forward, I would like you to describe why all 17 of the time you are requesting is necessary. 18 As I read the original scheduling order, 19 I read that to mean non-expert deposition discovery, and 20 I read that, therefore, to mean non-expert deposition 21 discovery even of contemplating third parties. 22 I am looking at the language dealing 23 with depositions. The second sentence of that paragraph 24 reads, "The limits on the number, length, and timing of</p>
Page 11	Page 13
<p>1 depositions -- I don't want to make amends -- but it 2 says, "Depositions shall be completed by November 17, 3 2006." That date was moved, by agreement of the parties, 4 but the parties had contemplated, I think, that that 5 reference really meant depositions of each other, not 6 necessarily third parties, I think, in part, because that 7 completion date was still 15 months before the start of 8 trial. 9 Recently, the parties agreed, among 10 themselves, that third-party discovery, deposition 11 discovery, could continue and end by, it was 90 days 12 before the trial, so I think that would be October 13 21st -- 14 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I saw that. 15 MR. KIRK: -- or thereabouts. And we 16 reported -- it was one of the few things we agreed on -- 17 and reported to Your Honor, in a letter from my partner, 18 Ashley Stitzer, on January 10. 19 The new scheduling order says that the 20 time to complete third-party discovery is March 30, 2007, 21 so at least our initial response is that that has at 22 least cut out -- the time we were contemplating by some 23 seven months. And at least right now, our -- LPL's 24 feeling is that there will be a difficulty in noticing,</p>	<p>1 non-expert depositions may be modified by agreement of 2 the parties or by order of the Court for good cause." 3 So, I guess what I need, in light of 4 what you are suggesting, is whether it is a joint 5 document or whether it is a document, no more than two 6 pages each, describing for me why you each believe there 7 is good cause to extend that right up to the front door 8 of the trial. 9 MR. KIRK: Yes, Your Honor. 10 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: And I realize, 11 you know, looking down at the scheduling order that Judge 12 Farnan entered, I know that the time frames are 13 challenging, but I also know that the discovery cutoff, 14 as it presently exists in that scheduling order, is 15 two-and-a-half months away. 16 So, if there is an interest to provide a 17 submittal that is jointly submitted, I am certainly happy 18 to receive that. 19 MR. KIRK: Your Honor, if may 20 suggest that counsel talk among themselves. 21 SPECIAL MASTER POPPITI: I was just 22 going to suggest if you want to take, even now, just a 23 few minutes off-line, I mean, I can do that. I will just 24 go off-line and I will dial back in so that you don't</p>